

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/835,884

Applicant(s)  
Sarkissian

Examiner  
Lun-yi Lao

Art Unit  
2673



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Bipin Shalwala

(3) Ralph Albrecht

(2) Lun-yi, Lao

(4) Arthur Sarkissian

Date of Interview Jul 18, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 20

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(see attached paper)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Lun-yi Lao  
Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 2673

The examiner has received applicant's 160 pages Amendment After Final on June 26th, 2003 on the RightFAX. In the morning of July 1, 2003, applicant and Mr. Ralph Albrecht argues that Kazarian(5,949,401), Ben-Arie(5,408,621) and Nagai(5,405,152) do not teach the limitation of "said key-surround key comprises a non-rotatable, substantially washer-shaped substantially circular data entry key" cited in claim 20. However, this new limitation was not **underlined** by applicant on the amendment after final filed on June 26, 2003 and the examiner thought the limitation of "said key-surround key comprises a non-rotatable, substantially washer-shaped substantially circular data entry key" has been searched on the final rejection those references(5,949,401, 5,408,621 and 5,405,152) are the best references for rejecting claim 20. Therefore, examiner was agreed to allow this application if some changes(suggested by Mr. Albrecht) and corrections have been made on this application. The same data later, the examiner discovered this limitation of "said key-surround key comprises a non-rotatable, substantially washer-shaped substantially circular data entry key" **does not contain** in claim 20 of the **amendment before final filed** on October 12, 2002 through painstaking line-by-line comparison. The amendment after final filed on June 26, 2003 raises new issue. The examiner needs to do further search on this application and can not allow this application at this time. The examiner called the applicant right away that he need to filed a RCE or Notice of Appeal in order to continue to process the application since this limitation of "said key-surround key comprises a non-rotatable, substantially washer-shaped substantially circular data entry key" is new issue.


Application/Control Number: 09/835,884

Page 3

Art Unit: 2673

The applicant failed to do it. Now, this case has been abandoned and the applicant needs to file a petition to revive the abandoned application.

July 18, 2003

  
**Lun-yi Lao**  
**Primary Examiner**

Note\*)

---

\*the applicant only crossed out the deleted items in the amendment after final filed on June 26, 2003, but did not underline the new limitation like he did his later(July 2, 2003) mailed-in After Final Amendment still puzzles the examiner.